

(ii) Recognized as inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent any cost or pricing data submitted; the action taken by the contracting officer and the contractor as a result; and the effect of the defective data on the price negotiated.

(6) If cost or pricing data were not required in the case of any price negotiation exceeding the cost or pricing data threshold, the exception used and the basis for it.

(7) A summary of the contractor's proposal, the field pricing report recommendations, and the reasons for any pertinent variances from the field pricing report recommendations. Where the determination of price reasonableness is based on cost analysis, the summary shall address the amount of each major cost element: (i) Proposed by the contractor, (ii) recommended by the field or other pricing assistance report (if any), (iii) contained in the Government's negotiation objective, and (iv) considered negotiated as a part of the price.

(8) The most significant facts or considerations controlling the establishment of the prenegotiation price objective and the negotiated price including an explanation of any significant differences between the two positions. To the extent such direction is received, the price negotiation memorandum (PNM) shall discuss and quantify the impact of direction given by Congress, other agencies, and higher level officials (i.e., officials who would not normally exercise authority during the award and review process for the instant contract action) if the direction has had a significant effect on the action.

(9) The basis for determining the profit or fee prenegotiation objective and the profit or fee negotiated.

(b) Whenever a field pricing report has been submitted, the contracting officer shall forward a copy of the price negotiation memorandum (PNM) to the cognizant audit office and a copy to the cognizant administrative contracting officer. When appropriate, information on how the advisory services of the field pricing support team can be made more effective should be provided separately.

[48 FR 42187, Sept. 19, 1983, as amended at 50 FR 1741, Jan. 11, 1985; 50 FR 52429, Dec. 23, 1985; 52 FR 19803, May 27, 1987; 55 FR 52791, Dec. 21, 1990; 56 FR 67414, Dec. 30, 1991; 60 FR 48217, Sept. 18, 1995]

#### **15.809 Forward pricing rates agreements.**

(a) Negotiation of forward pricing rate agreements (FPRA's) may be requested by the contracting officer or the contractor or initiated by the administrative contracting officer (ACO). In determining whether or not to establish such an agreement, the ACO should consider whether the benefits to be derived from the agreement are commensurate with the effort of establishing and mon-

itoring it. Normally, FPRA's should be negotiated only with contractors having a significant volume of Government contract proposals. The cognizant contract administration agency shall determine whether an FPRA will be established.

(b) The ACO shall obtain the contractor's proposal and require that it include cost or pricing data that are accurate, complete, and current as of the date of submission. The ACO shall invite the cognizant contract auditor and contracting offices having a significant interest to participate in developing a Government objective and in the negotiations. Upon completing negotiations, the ACO shall prepare a price negotiation memorandum (PNM) (see 15.808) and forward copies of the PNM and FPRA to the cognizant auditor and to all contracting offices that are known to be affected by the FPRA. A Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data shall not be required at this time (see 15.804-4(g)).

(c) The FPRA shall provide specific terms and conditions covering expiration, application, and data requirements for systematic monitoring to assure the validity of the rates. The agreement shall provide for cancellation at the option of either party and shall require the contractor to submit to the ACO and to the cognizant contract auditor any significant change in cost or pricing data.

(d) Offerors are required (see 15.804-4(g)) to describe any FPRA's in each specific pricing proposal to which the rates apply and identify the latest cost or pricing data already submitted in accordance with the agreement. All data submitted in connection with the agreement, updated as necessary, form a part of the total data that the offeror certifies to be accurate, complete, and current at the time of agreement on price for an initial contract or for a contract modification.

(e) Contracting officers will use FPRA rates as bases for pricing all contracts, modifications, and other contractual actions to be performed during the period covered by the agreement, unless the ACO determines that changed conditions have invalidated part or all of the agreement. Conditions that may affect the agreement's validity shall be promptly reported to the ACO. If the ACO determines that a changed condition has invalidated the agreement, the ACO shall notify all interested parties of the extent of its effect and initiate revision of the agreement.

(f) When the FPRA has been invalidated, the contractor, ACO, and contracting officer shall reflect the changed conditions in proposals, cost analyses, and negotiations, pending revision of the agreement. If an FPRA has not been established or has been invalidated, the ACO will issue a forward pricing rate recommendation (FPRR) to buying activities with documentation to assist negotiators in achieving recommended rates. In

the absence of a FPRA or FPRR, field pricing reports will include support for rates utilized.

[48 FR 42187, Sept. 19, 1983, as amended at 55 FR 52791, Dec. 21, 1990]

#### **15.810 Should-cost review.**

##### **15.810-1 General.**

(a) Should-cost reviews are a specialized form of cost analysis. Should-cost reviews differ from traditional evaluation methods. During traditional reviews, local contract audit and contract administration personnel primarily base their evaluation of forecasted costs on an analysis of historical costs and trends. In contrast, should-cost reviews do not assume that a contractor's historical costs reflect efficient and economical operation. Instead, these reviews evaluate the economy and efficiency of the contractor's existing work force, methods, materials, facilities, operating systems, and management. These reviews are accomplished by a multi-functional team of Government contracting, contract administration, pricing, audit, and engineering representatives. The objective of should-cost reviews is to promote both short and long-range improvements in the contractor's economy and efficiency in order to reduce the cost of performance of Government contracts. In addition, by providing rationale for any recommendations and quantifying their impact on cost, the Government will be better able to develop realistic objectives for negotiation.

(b) There are two types of should-cost reviews—program should-cost review (see 15.810-2) and overhead should-cost review (see 15.810-3). These should-cost reviews may be performed together or independently. The scope of a should-cost review can range from a large-scale review examining the contractor's entire operation (including plant-wide overhead and selected major subcontractors) to a small-scale tailored review examining specific portions of a contractor's operation.

[61 FR 2635, Jan. 26, 1996]

##### **15.810-2 Program should-cost review.**

(a) Program should-cost review is used to evaluate significant elements of direct costs, such as material and labor, and associated indirect costs, usually incurred in the production of major systems. When a program should-cost review is conducted relative to a contractor proposal, a separate audit report on the proposal is required.

(b) A program should-cost review should be considered, particularly in the case of a major system acquisition (see part 34), when—

- (1) Some initial production has already taken place;
- (2) The contract will be awarded on a sole-source basis;

(3) There are future year production requirements for substantial quantities of like items;

(4) The items being acquired have a history of increasing costs;

(5) The work is sufficiently defined to permit an effective analysis and major changes are unlikely;

(6) Sufficient time is available to plan and conduct the should-cost review adequately; and

(7) Personnel with the required skills are available or can be assigned for the duration of the should-cost review.

(c) The contracting officer should decide which elements of the contractor's operation have the greatest potential for cost savings and assign the available personnel resources accordingly. While the particular elements to be analyzed are a function of the contract work task, elements such as manufacturing, pricing and accounting, management and organization, and subcontract and vendor management are normally reviewed in a should-cost review.

(d) In acquisitions for which a program should-cost review is conducted, a separate program should-cost review team report, prepared in accordance with agency procedures, is required. Field pricing reports are required only to the extent that they contribute to the combined team position. The contracting officer shall consider the findings and recommendations contained in the program should-cost review team report when negotiating the contract price. After completing the negotiation, the contracting officer shall provide the administrative contracting officer (ACO) a report of any identified uneconomical or inefficient practices, together with a report of correction or disposition agreements reached with the contractor. The contracting officer shall establish a follow-up plan to monitor the correction of the uneconomical or inefficient practices.

(e) When a program should-cost review is planned, the contracting officer should state this fact in the acquisition plan (see subpart 7.1) and in the solicitation.

[61 FR 2636, Jan. 26, 1996]

##### **15.810-3 Overhead should-cost review.**

(a) An overhead should-cost review is used to evaluate indirect costs, such as fringe benefits, shipping and receiving, facilities and equipment, depreciation, plant maintenance and security, taxes, and general and administrative activities. It is normally used to evaluate and negotiate a forward pricing rate agreement (FPRA) with the contractor. When an overhead should-cost review is conducted, a separate audit report is required.

(b) The following factors should be considered when selecting contractor sites for overhead should-cost reviews: